

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 5, 7, 9, 13 and 25-34 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 7, 9 and 13 are amended, claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 14-24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 25-34 are added. No new matter is added.

**I. Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claims 1-2, 5-10, and 13-14 for various informalities. As claims 1, 5, 7, 9 and 13 have been amended to correct these informalities, and claims 2, 6, 8, 10 and 14 are canceled, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-14, and 17-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that there is no support for using a solvent vapor removal device to control a solvent vapor. As the claims directed to controlling a solvent vapor are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, this rejection is moot.

The Office Action also asserts that there is lack of support for various claims, and notes that there is support for blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing the solvent vapor through suction. Without conceding the propriety of the Office Action's characterizations regarding a lack of support for certain claims, as the claims have been amended to include a feature the Examiner indicated is supported by the specification, this rejection is also moot.

**III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,350 (Aoki) and rejects claims 1-2, 5-6, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over WO 01/70506 (Kawase). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, in part, "forcibly removing a solvent vapor evaporating from a droplet arranged previously on the substrate by a solvent vapor removal device prior to completing droplet arrangement on the entire substrate, said solvent vapor removal device forcibly removing said solvent vapor by blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing said solvent vapor through suction." Claims 5, 7, 9 and 13 recite similar a feature.

Aoki discloses a production method of a plasma display panel. Ink is spouted from nozzle 34 to form a continuous ink flow. Air flow 37 is spouted from air nozzles 36 to put pressure upon the ink. See col. 10, lines 44-58. Aoki does not disclose removing solvent vapor through suction. Therefore, Aoki does not teach or suggest "forcibly removing said solvent vapor by blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing said solvent vapor through suction."

Kawase discloses a method of depositing soluble material on a substrate, in which a flow of gas is applied between the ink-jet print head and the substrate. Kawase does not disclose removing solvent vapor through suction. Therefore, Kawase also does not teach or suggest "forcibly removing said solvent vapor by blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing said solvent vapor through suction."

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

### **III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

The Office Action (1) rejects claims 7-10, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kawase, (2) rejects claims 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kawase in view of WO 98/24271 (Miyashita), (3) rejects claims 1-2, 5-10, 13-14, 17, 19, 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,830,494 (Yamazaki) in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0016260 (Yoshida) and U.S. Patent No. 6,030,700 (Forrest). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

**A. Kawase and Kawase in view of Miyashita**

Claims 8-10, 14, 21 and 23 are canceled, and thus the rejection of claims 8-10, 14, 21 and 23 is moot.

As discussed above, Kawase does not teach or suggest "forcibly removing said solvent vapor by blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing said solvent vapor through suction." Thus, as Kawase does not teach or suggest all of the features of claims 7 and 13, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 13 is respectfully requested.

Miyashita fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kawase. Miyashita teaches a production method for a plasma display panel. Miyashita does not teach or suggest "forcibly removing said solvent vapor by blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing said solvent vapor through suction."

**B. Yamazaki in view of Yoshida and Forrest**

The Office Acknowledges that Yamazaki does not teach or suggest forcibly removing a solvent vapor; however, the Office Action asserts that since Forrest teaches that blowing nitrogen at a substrate can remove solvent it would have been obvious to combine Yamazaki with Forrest to "reduce production costs." Without conceding the propriety of the Office Action's asserted motivation to combine the references, none of Yamazaki, Yoshida, and Forrest teaches or suggests "forcibly removing said solvent vapor by blowing gas on the substrate and simultaneously removing said solvent vapor through suction." Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 9, and 13 is respectfully requested.

**IV. New Claims 25-34**

Claims 25-34 variously recite "wherein during suction the gas flows away from the ink jet head" or "wherein the gas is blown at an angle of 30 to 60 degrees to a direction perpendicular to a movement direction of the ink jet head." These features are neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art. Claims 25-34 are not anticipated by and would not have

been obvious from the cited prior art at least based on their dependence on allowable base claims, as well as for additional features they recite.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff  
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JAN/jnm

Date: March 15, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

|  |
|--|
| <p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE<br/>AUTHORIZATION<br/>Please grant any extension<br/>necessary for entry;<br/>Charge any fee due to our<br/>Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p> |
|--|